

REMARKS

The present Application was filed on November 26, 2003, with original Claims 1-35. By this amendment, claims 1, 4, 15, 16, 25, 27, 28, 30, 33, 34, and 35 have been amended, and claims 3, 26, 29, 31, and 32 have been cancelled. The claims remaining in consideration are Claims 1 through 2, 4-25, 27, 28, 30, 33, and 35. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 16-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps. Claim 16 is dependent upon independent claim 15, which includes the step of “displaying a plurality of user interface screens enabling the user to select a health care process”. The next step has been amended as follows: “displaying the health care process selected by the user on the display device”. Applicants respectfully assert that with the amendment to the last step of independent claim 15, claims 16-24 are now complete.

Claim 25 has been amended to be in independent form. Amended independent claim 25 includes a step of “enabling the user to select a health care process from the list of health care processes”. Applicants therefore respectfully assert that amended independent claim 25 is complete under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Therefore, applicants respectfully request that the § 112 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 20020194023 to Turley, *et al.* (“Turley”). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 1 and 15 are independent claims. Independent claims 1 and 15 have been amended to more clearly identify the subject matter applicants regard as the invention.

Amended independent claim 1 sets forth a computer system for displaying health care processes. The computer system includes a network, a server, and a computer. The server is coupled to the network in communication with a health care process database. The health care process database stores a plurality of health care processes. The server is programmed to receive signals representative of a unique health care process and the server is programmed to send, in response to the signals, information illustrative of the health care process. The computer is coupled to the network. The computer is programmed to display an interactive user interface for selecting a health care process, communicate with the server when a user selects a health care process, and receive information illustrative of the health care process from the server. The computer also decodes information and displays the health care process to the user. The interactive user interface includes a graphic display of a medical facility and a graphic display of a first human body image. The user is able to select representations of inanimate objects within the graphic display of the medical facility to select health care processes related to various inanimate objects therein. The user is also able to select representations of areas of the graphic display of the human body to select health care processes related to the selected representations of areas of the human body. This increases the accuracy or the flexibility of the computer system.

In contrast, Turley sets forth a method for selecting an orthopedic component for use in an orthopedic procedure. The Turley system displays a graphic representation of a skeleton (*see* Figure 3) which the user may select various portions thereof and a second graphic representation of a particular area of the skeleton may be displayed (*see* Figure 4). With the selection of a

desired location, the Turley system may display different types of fractures (*see* Figure 5). Selection of a particular fracture will result in the display of various hardware or devices which may be used to treat the selected fracture (*see* Figure 6). In addition, information related to the use of a selected hardware or device may also be displayed (*see* Figure 7). However, Turley does not display a graphic representation of a medical facility and therefore does not allow a user to select or search for a health care process based on inanimate objects within a medical facility. Since Turley does not include each and every element of amended independent Claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that the § 102(e) rejection is improper and must be withdrawn. Claim 2 is dependent on amended allowable independent Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that independent Claim 2 is also allowable.

Amended independent Claim 15 sets forth a computer implemented method for displaying a health care process to a user. The method includes the step of displaying a first interactive user interface screen on a display device. The interactive user interface screen includes a graphic display of a medical facility and a graphic display of a first human body image. In response to user selection, the method displays a plurality of user interface screens enabling the user to select a health care process. The user is able to select representations of inanimate objects within the graphic display of the medical facility to select health care processes related to various inanimate objects therein. The user is also able to select representations of various other graphic displays of the human body to select health care processes related to the selected representations of areas of the human body. Lastly, the method includes the step of displaying the health care process selected by the user on a display device.

As discussed above, Turley does not include a interactive user interface screen which includes a graphic display of a medical facility *and* a graphic display of a first human body image. This allows the user to select or to identify a health care process by selecting inanimate objects within the graphic display of the medical facility *or* representations of areas of the graphic display of the human body. This increases the flexibility and usability of the system. Since Turley does not include each and every step of independent amended claim 15, applicants respectfully assert that the § 102(e) rejection is improper and must be withdrawn.

Dependent Claim 16 is dependent upon amended allowable independent Claim 15. Therefore, for the reasons set forth above, and based on its own merit, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent Claim 16 is also allowable.

Claims 3-6 and 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turley in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,208,974 issued March 27, 2001 to Scott Douglas Campbell, *et al.* (“Campbell”). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 3-6 and 17-19 are ultimately dependent upon independent claims 1 and 15 respectively. The Examiner utilizes Campbell to teach a graphical representation of a pet. However, Campbell does not overcome the deficiencies of Turley as described above. Therefore Applicants respectfully assert that dependent Claims 3-6 and 17-19 are allowable based on the arguments above and their own merits. Therefore, applicants respectfully request that the § 103(a) rejection of claims 3-6 and 17-19 be withdrawn.

Claims 7-11 and 20-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turley in view of Campbell and in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication

20050039138 to Urbina (“Urbina”). Claims 7-11 and 20-22 are ultimately dependent upon allowable independent Claims 1 and 15, respectively. Urbina does not overcome the deficiencies of Turley and/or Campbell as discussed above. Therefore, for the reasons set forth above and based on their own merits, applicants respectfully assert that claims 7-11 and 20-22 are allowable.

Claims 12-14 and 23-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turley in view of Campbell and in view of Urbina and in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 20040068478 to Stubbs (“Stubbs”). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 12-14 and 23-24 are ultimately dependent upon allowable independent claims 1 and 15, respectively. Stubbs does not overcome the deficiencies of Turley, Campbell and Urbina as discussed above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 12-14 and 23-24 are allowable.

Claims 25, 27, 28, 30, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turley in view of Campbell in view of Urbina and in further view of Stubbs. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 25 has been amended to be in independent form. Amended independent Claim 25 sets forth a method of displaying a health care process to a user. The method includes the steps of displaying a first interactive user interface screen and display device, allowing a user to establish a user identity through interaction with the first interactive user interface screen, and establishing a location of the user on accessing the system. The method also includes a step of comparing the user identity and the location with an access database. The access database

contains a list of health care processes previously accessed by the user and/or accessed at the location. The method further includes the steps of displaying a list of health care processes to the user as a function of the list of health care processes *previously accessed by the user and/or accessed at the location*, enabling the user to select a health care process from a list of health care processes, displaying the selected health care process to the user, and updating the access database with the user, the location, and a selected health care process.

Neither Turley, Campbell, Urbina and/or Stubbs singularly or in combination teach such a method. In particular, none of the prior art references teach a method of displaying a list of health care processes based on either the health care processes previously accessed by a user and/or the health care processes previously accessed at a given location. Since none of the prior art singularly or in combination includes all the steps of independent method claim 25, applicants respectfully assert that the §103 rejection of amended independent claim 25 is improper and must be withdrawn. Dependent claims 27-28, 30, and 33 are ultimately dependent upon allowable amended independent claim 25. Therefore, for the reasons set forth above, and based on their own merits, applicants respectfully assert that dependent claims 27-28, 30, and 33 are allowable.

Claims 30-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turley in view of Campbell and in further view of Urbina and Stubbs and further in view of official notice. The Examiner takes official notice that “health care facilities often record individual actions, and/or actions performed at a specific location, for later review for the purposes of conducting performance evaluations and work flow management studies.”

However, claims 34 and 35 are ultimately dependent upon allowable independent Claim

Applicant: Patrick J. Sweeney
Serial No.: 10/723,100
Group Art Unit: 4194

25. The Examiner's official notice does not overcome the deficiencies of the prior art as detailed above. Therefore, for the reasons set forth above and based on their own merits, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent claims 34 and 35 are also allowable.

All of Examiner's rejections having been made moot or successfully overcome, applicants respectfully assert that the present application is in condition for allowance.

Applicants believe that no fees are due, however, if any become required, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account 08-2789.

Respectfully submitted

HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS, P.C.

April 15, 2008
Date

/James R. Yee/
James R. Yee, Registration No. 34,460
The Pinehurst Office Center, Suite #101
39400 Woodward Avenue
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48304
(248) 645-1483